

STATE PROPERTIES COMMITTEE MEETING

TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2013

The meeting of the State Properties Committee was called to order at 10:03 a.m. by Chairman Ronald N. Renaud. Attendance of the members was taken by roll call and the following members made their presence known: Robert K. Griffith representing the Rhode Island Department of Administration; Richard Woolley representing the Rhode Island Department of Attorney General; Michael Goldberg representing the Rhode Island Office of the General Treasurer, Ex-Officio Member. Others in attendance were Kelly Carpenter from the Rhode Island Fiscal Senate; Paul Carcieri, Daniel Clarke, Robert Jackson and Colleen Kerr from the Rhode Island Department of Transportation; Stephen Bunero and Ron Racine from the Island Department of Human Services; Deborah White, John Ryan and Michael Mitchell from the Rhode Island Department of Administration; Senator James Sheehan, Representative Doreen Costa, Louis F. Vastane, Jr., James Grundy, Peter Brassard, David Bestwick, Michael Bestwick, Paul Harrington, Ron Mann, Bill Phillips, David San Antonio, Donald Mattera, James Zuffolitti, Richard Welch, Tom Sgovros, Laurne Lazarides and Jimmy Lazarides from the Town of North Kingstown and surrounding areas.

Chairman Renaud stated for the record that the State Properties Committee did have a quorum present.

A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting held on December 4, 2012 was made by Mr. Woolley and seconded by Mr. Griffith.

Passed Unanimously

ITEM A – Department of Administration – Request was made for approval of and signatures on a License Agreement, by and between the Department of Administration and the Puerto Rican Cultural Festival of Rhode Island to allow said organization to utilize the State House for the 2013 Regional Conference of Puerto Rican Day Parade Dedication to Rhode Island. Ms. White stated that the applicant was not present, but that she would present what information she had relative to the subject request. Ms. White explained that the applicant wishes to utilize the State House on February 9, 2013, for the 2013 Regional Conference of the Puerto Rican Cultural Festival of Rhode Island and to announce the Puerto Rican Day Parade Dedication to Rhode Island. Ms. White indicated that the Division of Facilities has not yet received the Certificate of Insurance for said event. Ms. White noted that the applicant opted to secure insurance coverage through Kevin Carvalho of Risk Management of the State of Rhode Island. Additionally, Ms. White stated that she has not received proof of liquor liability insurance; therefore, Ms. White indicated that if the Committee were to approve the subject request, said approval would be subject to the submission of the required Certificate of Insurance and Endorsement including proof of liquor liability insurance. Mr. Griffith asked if time is of the essence relative to the subject request. Ms. White indicated that as the event is planned for February 9, 2013 and there is a State Properties Committee meeting scheduled for January 29, 2013, she does not believe there is any reason why the matter can not be re-considered at that time. Ms. White explained

that she initially heard from the Puerto Rican Cultural Festival of Rhode Island just last week, which is typically not sufficient time to obtain all necessary signatures and/or documentation required by an applicant. Mr. Griffith asked exactly what portion of the State House the applicant is proposing to utilize for the subject event. Ms. White indicated that the applicant wishes to utilize the valet area, hallways and the Rotunda. Ms. White stated that it is her understanding that the applicant contacted the Governor's Office for permission to utilize the State Room as well. Chairman Renaud suggested that the request before the Committee be tabled to a future meeting of the State Properties Committee and that the Division of Facilities clearly define the rules and regulations relative to the use of the State House, in particular the State Room. Ms. White noted that it is her understanding that the request before the Committee was originally initiated by the Governor's Office; however, the applicant later contacted the Division of Facilities regarding use of the State House. Ms. White stated that this event is by invitation only and is closed to the public. The Capitol Police have been notified of the expected number of guests who will attend said event. Additionally, she noted that the applicant will be responsible for the cost of engaging the services of the Capitol Police for the event as well as additional staffing from the Division of Facilities Management. Mr. Woolley agreed that this item should be tabled to the next scheduled State Properties Committee meeting to allow the applicant to secure and submit the required certificates of insurance and endorsement and to allow the Committee to obtain more information relative to said

request. Further, Chairman Renaud recommended that a representative for the applicant is available to answer questions and to address any and all concerns of the State Properties Committee at the next meeting. A motion was made to table item A to the January 29, 2013 meeting of the State Properties Committee at the request of the State Properties Committee, by Mr. Woolley and seconded by Mr. Griffith.

Passed Unanimously

ITEM B – Department of Human Services – A request was made for approval of and signatures on a Lease Agreement, by and between Emanon Associates, LP and the Department of Human Services for the premises located at 40 Fountain Street in the City of Providence. Mr. Ryan explained that the subject premises was fully occupied by the Department of General Treasurer’s Office until said office was relocated to the State-owned facility located at 50 Service Avenue in the City of Warwick. Mr. Ryan explained that although the subject premises does not encompass a large amount of space, the program benefits received by the Department of Human Services are significant. Mr. Ryan noted that Mr. Brunero would inform the Committee regarding said program benefits in just a moment, however, Mr. Ryan wished to note that the Lease Agreement is a standard State lease agreement, which was utilized for the other DHS offices and the Ethics Commission occupying space at this location. Mr. Ryan noted that the rental rate of \$15.70 per square foot remains the same with escalator provisions for the base utility services. Mr. Ryan reiterated that Mr. Brunero would explain the program benefits

for the Department of Human Services and they would answer any questions the Committee may have regarding said Lease Agreement. Chairman Renaud asked from a lease prospective, if there is any tax treaty associated with the subject Lease Agreement. Mr. Ryan noted that he and Attorney Mitchell have been working with the City of Providence regarding what is being referred to as the Tax Settlement Agreement and are within two (2) weeks of finalizing the same. However, Mr. Ryan emphasized that said Tax Settlement Agreement will not affect the subject Lease Agreement for 1,820 square feet of office space, as the term of the Lease is less than ten (10) years. It will, however, affect other DHS and Ethics Commission leases as it will be included as a lease amendment to those leases. Mr. Brunero stated that the subject premises is located on the first floor of the facility and as the Office works with individuals with disabilities and has of late seen a large increase in the number of people applying for services such as social security disability and vocational rehabilitation, there are obviously Americans with Disabilities Act "ADA" issues to consider. Mr. Brunero explained that because many clients are blind, visually impaired and/or confined to wheelchairs it is important that the office be situated on the ground level alleviating the need for use of elevators to access the premises. Beyond the accessibility issue, Mr. Brunero also believes that the safety and security of clients and staff is better served by occupying the first floor of any facility. Chairman Renaud stated for the record that it is his understanding that Emanon Associates, LP has been and continues to be an outstanding landlord. Mr. Ryan agreed that the

State has enjoyed a great working relationship with the landlord and that they have always been very responsible and amenable to meeting the needs of all State-offices occupying their properties. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Woolley and seconded by Mr. Griffith.

Passed Unanimously

ITEM C – Department of Education – A request was made for conceptual approval for the disposition of property located at 100 Metropolitan Avenue in the City of Cranston; the site of the Cranston Area Career and Technical Center. Mr. da Silva explained that the Department of Education has several properties which are State-owned, but operated by the local school districts. Mr. da Silva stated that in addition to the Cranston Area Career and Technical Center property, the Department has two (2) other such properties; one in Warwick and the other in Woonsocket. Mr. da Silva indicated that the Department has transferred the Chariho, Providence, East Providence and Newport facilities. Mr. da Silva explained that the disposition of said properties is a cost saving measure for the State and noted that there was recently a \$50 million dollar bond issued for repairs to these facilities; however, the Department believes it will be more cost effective if the local school districts bear the responsibility and expense of necessary improvements and/or repairs to said facilities and will further serve to streamline the issue of tenants occupying State-owned property. Mr. da Silva indicated that for the reasons stated above, he respectfully requests conceptual approval for the disposition of the subject property located at 100 Metropolitan

Avenue in the City of Cranston and is happy to answer any questions the Committee may have. Chairman Renaud commended the Department for its prudent judgment, efforts and progress relative to the conveyance of the afore-mentioned facilities to the local school districts in good repair. A motion to grant conceptual approval for the disposition of the subject property located at 100 Metropolitan Avenue in the City of Cranston, with the understanding that the draft transfer document may need to be revised in light of the issues concerning the Chariho facility, was made by Mr. Woolley. Mr. Griffith seconded said motion, subject to the final transfer documents containing a reverter clause.

Passed Unanimously

ITEM D – Department of Transportation – A request for approval of and signatures on a Quit Claim Deed, by and between the Department of Transportation and the Town of Burrillville to convey 3.3 acres of land located on Chapel Street (Route 107) in the Town of Burrillville. Mr. Clarke explained that the Department is seeking the Committee's final approval to convey the subject property to the Town of Burrillville for recreational use. By way of background, Mr. Clarke explained that the Department was previously before the Committee in 201 seeking approval for the Town to put a small recreational area within the subject parcel of land which has been vacant since 1949. Subsequent to the Committee's approval of said request, the Town indicated that it was seeking approval and funding from the Department of Environmental Management to develop a walking trail and to expand a playground located on the property. Mr. Clarke

explained that he then approached the Town Council requesting that the Town purchase the entire parcel of land. Using a site map, Mr. Clarke illustrated the exact location of the entire subject property and further identified a drainage easement and a flood compensation area, which he explained was basically a wetlands replacement area that resulted from the reconstruction of a nearby bridge together with the resurfacing of Chapel Street. Mr. Clarke indicated that rather than return to the Committee several times with requests from the Town to purchase additional land, he negotiated a purchase of the entire parcel, which has been deemed to be of no value to the State. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Woolley and seconded by Mr. Griffith.

Passed Unanimously

ITEM E – Department of Transportation – A request was made for reconsideration of the original Proposal Award for the Park-n-Ride lot located at Routes 2 & 102 in the Town of North Kingstown. Mr. Carcieri explained that the Department was previously before the Committee seeking conceptual approval for the sale of a park and ride facility located at Routes 2 & 102 in the Town of North Kingstown. Mr. Carcieri stated that the sale was pursuant to a request for proposals which had been advertised in 2009. He noted that one element of the request for proposals called for the successful bidder to not only purchase the park and ride facility, but to also provide an alternate lot for commuter use. Mr. Carcieri indicated that the State Properties Committee approved said proposal in November of 2011 and the successful applicant was North

Kingstown Pharmacy Associates, LLP. Mr. Carcieri explained that the Department is before the Committee today asking a procedural question and to seek the Committee's guidance and opinion as to whether it has the ability, within the wording of the aforementioned request for proposals, to not impose the condition requiring the development of a replacement lot as a provision of the conveyance of the subject parcel of land. Mr. Carcieri noted that said request for proposals does in fact give the State the flexibility to alter and/or amend the proposal, in its sole judgment, if said proposal is deemed to be in the over all best interest of the State. Mr. Carcieri indicated that there have been some public inquiries made regarding the question before the Committee. Mr. Carcieri assured the Committee that the Department has made no final decision concerning the conveyance of the Routes 2 and 102 park and ride facility. That being said, Mr. Carcieri indicated that he and/or Mr. Jackson together with other representatives from the Department would be happy to answer any questions the Committee may have. Mr. Woolley stated that his recollection was that the development of a replacement park and ride facility was a very significant component of the request for proposals and was in fact the reason the Department received only one response, despite the fact that eight (8) or nine (9) other potential bidders expressed their interest at the pre-bid conference. Mr. Carcieri noted that the request for proposals clearly states that an alternate park and ride site would be provided. Mr. Woolley asserted that said condition would have certainly discouraged other potential bidders from even submitting a proposal and is most likely the

reason the Department received only one proposal. Mr. Carcieri agreed that a potential bidder may have presumed from the language contained in the request for proposals that if they did not have a replacement site then they could not have successfully responded to the request for proposals. Chairman Renaud recalled that when this matter was initially brought before the Committee, the members suspected that the reason the Department received only one response was because none of the other bidders had land to offer for the development of a replacement park and ride facility, which caused the members great concern. Chairman Renaud additionally noted that at that time, the Committee inquired whether the Department had investigated the possibility of alternative sites as a park and ride facility whether State or privately owned in the area and the Department indicated that there were no suitable sites for the development of a replacement park and ride facility available at that time. Additionally, Chairman Renaud stated that the Committee reviewed several aerial maps in an attempt to identify available land in the vicinity that would be suitable to develop a replacement park and ride facility. Further, the Committee made clear its concerns regarding the absence of available land for an alternative site to the Department of Transportation. Additionally, Chairman Renaud recalled that the Committee inquired as to whether commuter parking would be available at Wickford Junction and the Department responded that there was no 'free' available parking at Wickford Junction. The Committee also looked at a nearby State-owned park and ride facility and was informed by the Department that said facility

could not accommodate the number of commuters presently utilizing the Routes 2 and 102 park and ride facility in addition to its own commuters. Mr. Carcieri stated that he recalled these discussions and he agreed that the request for proposals did specifically state that an alternate park and ride facility would be provided. Mr. Carcieri also agreed that the Department determined that the park and ride facility located at the end of Quaker Lane would not be able to accommodate the total number of commuters utilizing the Routes 2 and 102 park and ride facility. However, Mr. Carcieri reiterated that question before the Committee today is whether the condition requiring a replacement park and ride facility outweighs the general language contained in the request for proposals document, which gives the State the flexibility to alter the document. Mr. Woolley stated that he has never had an opportunity to review request for proposals. Mr. Carcieri felt sure the Department had provided the Committee with a copy of the request for proposals. Mr. Woolley reiterated that he has never received a copy and would like an opportunity to review the same. Chairman Renaud agreed that the condition requiring a developer to provide a replacement park and ride facility was a very significant component, which if not imposed or honored, would change the very integrity of the request for proposals as advertised. Therefore, it is his position that the Department should clearly state its intentions relative to the subject property via a new request for proposals to be issued after the Committee has had an opportunity to review the same. Mr. Griffith explained that regardless of the specificity of the request for

proposals, the fact is that the public would be denied the obvious benefit of a free park and ride facility, which it has enjoyed for many years. Mr. Griffith stated that not only will public commuters be affected, but RIPTA is sure to be affected by the loss of said facility. Mr. Griffith asked if RIPTA has been consulted regarding the Department's intention to sell the subject property without the condition that a replacement facility be constructed by the successful candidate. Mr. Carcieri stated that RIPTA was previously consulted regarding the sale of the subject property and approved the facilities new location in November of 2011. Mr. Carcieri indicated that RIPTA is amenable to the closure of the Routes 2 and 102 park and ride facility, provided the new lot was erected and the Department clearly represented RIPTA's position to the Committee in November of 2011. Given Mr. Carcieri's last statement, Mr. Woolley questioned why the Department appears to be doing a complete about face relative to this project. Mr. Carcieri explained that during the intervening time between November of 2011 and now, the legalities of the Intermodal Station opening and the prospect of available public parking, created a different lay of the land from what it was in then and the Department merely wishes to investigate all available options. Chairman Renaud stated that although he can appreciate the Department's position, he reiterated that the Committee specifically asked whether free parking within Wickford Station was or could be made available to public commuters and the answer was "no." The Committee was told that the daily rate for public parking within the Wickford facility would be approximately \$3.00 to \$4.00. Chairman Renaud stated that his major

concerns are the adverse affects and hardships facing the commuters whom rely upon the existing facility for transportation and ever rising energy costs. Chairman Renaud stated that the proposal before the Committee today appears to be in absolute opposition to the State's energy policy and its attempt to encourage the public to reduce energy consumption by taking advantage of alternative means of transportation. Chairman Renaud noted that the State's park and ride facilities are the best alternative the State has to offer in terms of reducing energy consumption as well as being the most utilized and preferred method of public commuters. Chairman Renaud advised Mr. Carcieri that a proposal for the closure of an existing park and ride facility in the absence of the development of an alternative site is difficult to even consider. Mr. Woolley asked if the existing park and ride facility were to be eliminated without a replacement facility being constructed, how feasible it is that the commuting public could utilize Wickford Junction for their public parking and transportation needs and whether there is even space available within said facility. Mr. Carcieri stated that although he can not answer Mr. Woolley's question with absolute certainty, he presumes that the Intermodel facility is handicapped and RIPTA accessible. However, Mr. Carcieri indicated that he would prefer to research the matter and provide the Committee with a more informed response at a later time. Mr. Woolley asked if the Department would have to enter into some sort of an agreement with Wickford Junction in order to ensure that there is a protected area in which commuters could wait for buses. Mr. Carcieri apologized and stated that he could

not accurately make a representation concerning Mr. Woolley's questions at this time. Chairman Renaud agreed that further examination of this matter was certainly necessary before any decisions could be made. Chairman Renaud asked if the Purchase and Sale Contract contained an expiration date. Mr. Carcieri stated that the Purchase and Sale Agreement was not time specific and that the Department received the executed Purchase and Sale Agreement in October of 2012; eleven months after obtaining conceptual approval from the Committee. Chairman Renaud asked if the Department is under any time constraints whatsoever regarding the sale of the subject property. Mr. Carcieri stated that he did not believe so. Mr. Griffith asked if the Department has researched any information available through the MBTA on the impact of parking fees at park and ride facilities as it is his understanding that fees have been raised considerably over the last several years. Mr. Carcieri again stated that he is unable to make any representation or even comment as this matter is being presented through him by the Real Estate Office; however, he indicated that he would certainly pose the question to the Department. Mr. Carcieri stated that the Department is reviewing a multiplicity of options including a proposal to forgo fees for public parking three (3) days per week, use of the Intermodel Station facility as well as an expansion of the Quaker Lane park and ride facility. Chairman Renaud stated that as the request before the Committee is such an extensive modification and clearly outside the scope of the advertised request for proposals, he suggests that this matter be tabled to allow the Department to fully investigate

alternative options and to garner additional information to address the questions and concerns of the Committee. Mr. Woolley believes that the Department should start from scratch and advertise a new request for proposals or proceed with the construction of the alternate park and ride facility as originally proposed. Mr. Carcieri wished to clarify the Committee's instructions and asked if the request for conceptual approval previously granted by the State Properties Committee on November 2011 remains unimpaired and that the Committee will not allow the Department to deviate from the request from proposals. The Committee stated that is correct. A motion to table Item E was made by Mr. Griffith and seconded by Mr. Woolley.

Passed Unanimously Under discussion, Chairman Renaud stated that public comments would be encouraged and welcomed at this time. Paul Harrison introduced himself as the President Business-Agent of our ATU Union Local 618, Providence Rhode Island, and indicated that he further considers himself an advocate of the Rhode Island public. Mr. Harrison stated that he greatly appreciated the decision of the Committee to table this matter and for its concern for the residents of Rhode Island that utilize the Routes 2 and 102 park and ride facility based upon need or want. Mr. Harrison noted that there are one hundred (100) vehicles parked in said lot daily and there are hundreds of passengers who depend upon this park and ride facility. Mr. Harrison once again thanked the Committee's for its decision to table this matter to allow the Department to fully investigate alternative options and to garner

additional information to address not only the questions and concerns of Committee, but those of the public commuters who rely upon this facility as well.

State Representative Costa stated that she represents District 31, wherein the subject park and ride facility is located and she repeatedly thanked the Committee for its decision to table this matter for further consideration. Representative Costa explained that the outcry from the Constituents that rely upon the Routes 2 and 102 park and ride facility has been astounding. Representative Costa noted that she has received myriad email transmissions from commuters who can not afford to lose this park and ride facility which they have relied upon for years to provide a safe and cost free means of accessing public transportation. She noted that many of these people wrote that they can simply not afford the four (\$4.00) dollars per day they would be charged if Wickford Junction were their only option. Representative Costa pledged to do anything she can, to work with the Department of Transportation, the Constituents and the Committee to make certain this facility, so essential to so many, remains where it is and should be. Representative Costa again thanked the Committee for tabling this matter for further consideration and stated that she personally does not need another CVS, nor do the Constituents; however, she indicated that the need for safe and cost free access to public transportation is vital.

Richard Welch, Town Council of North Kingstown, explained that he is aware that correspondence from the President of the Town Council was forwarded to the Committee this morning as a Council meeting

was held last night. Mr. Welch indicated that he is before the Committee today to convey the consensus of the Town Council as a whole and to inform the Committee that the Council adamantly opposes the Department of Transportation's proposal to eliminate the Routes 102 and 2 Park and Ride facility without providing an alternative facility. Further, Mr. Welch indicated that he, together with the other members of the Town Council, are very concerned about the lack of public notice given to the Town and its residents regarding the subject proposal. As such, Mr. Welch stated that it appears there was a deliberate attempt to conceal a transaction, which could affect hundreds of commuters. Mr. Welch indicated that going forward he strongly suggests that there be a greatly enhanced effort by the State to notify the public, to encourage public input and to seriously consider the public's position and its best interest when advertising a request for proposals. Mr. Welch noted the elimination of the North Kingstown Park and Ride facility will not only affect the residents of North Kingstown, but the residence of East Greenwich and other surrounding communities. Mr. Welch thanked the Committee for its decision to table this matter and for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Town Council and the residents of North Kingstown.

Senator Sheehan representing the Towns of North Kingstown and Narragansett apologized for being late, but indicated he was at another meeting just prior to his arrival. Senator Sheehan thanked the Committee for tabling this item for further consideration, as he believes the Department of Transportation's original proposal to provide an alternate park and ride facility was appropriate. Senator

Sheehan stated that there is an expectation that when State-owned property is sold, said transaction will result in a benefit to its residents, rather than the loss of an important public resource. Senator Sheehan indicated that the subject transaction involves a park and ride facility that the commuting public can currently utilize without cost, therefore, it is extremely important to retain said asset or to provide an alternative site, as to do otherwise would defeat the efforts made by the State to encourage commuters to share rides together with its efforts to assist RIPTA, which at this time, undoubtedly needs help. Senator Sheehan indicated that as the Towns of North Kingstown and Narragansett's suburban rider ship often helps support the overall citizens of the State, he appreciates and is grateful for the Committee's decision to table the Department's request pending further information. Further. Senator Sheehan noted that many in government were surprised by the lack of sufficient notice given relative to the subject transaction in fact the Senator indicated that he just became aware of the same last night. Lastly, Senator Sheehan asked that the State Properties Committee keep in mind that the Routes 2 and 102 park and ride facility is an invaluable asset to both the Constituents and the State and that the members proceed accordingly.

A member of the public indicated that he would have rejected the Department of Transportation's proposal. He asked whether the State Properties Committee is obligated to do anything further in order to move this project along or has the Committee fulfilled its obligations relative to this matter. Chairman Renaud explained that any and all

requests considered by this Committee are generated by individual State agencies. Further, Chairman Renaud indicated that this Committee has no ability by itself to expedite or impede any particular request other than to request that a matter be tabled in order to allow an agency the opportunity to provide the Committee with additional information prior to its making a decision and voting to either grant or deny said request. Chairman Renaud noted that with regard to the instant matter, the request for proposals was brought before the Committee and conceptual approval was granted allowing the Department to conduct due diligence relative to said request. However, the agency is compelled to return to the State Properties Committee with the results of the request for proposals and for execution of the final document prior to obtaining final approval of its request. The gentleman clarified that the Committee still retains the power to deny the request as presented today. Chairman Renaud indicated that is correct.

Michael Bestwick indicated that he has been involved in this transaction for the past 6 ½ years as he is the owner of the land previously proposed for the new site of the North Kingstown park and ride facility. Mr. Bestwick indicated that he prepared an information package for each of the Committee members. Mr. Bestwick informed the Committee that he signed a Purchase and Sale Agreement 6 ½ years ago. He questioned why the Department of Transportation's proposal seems to have made a swift 180 degree turn. Mr. Bestwick noted that when he first attended a State Properties Committee meeting concerning this matter, the Department represented that the

request for proposals included a provision that stipulated the construction of a replacement park and ride facility and that said provision was non-negotiable. Mr. Bestwick recalls that the Committee went back and forth with the Department and eventually agreed that the replacement facility provision would remain a specification of the request for proposals issued by the Department in 2009 for the sale of the Routes 2 and 102 park and ride facility. Mr. Bestwick questioned who would benefit from this new proposal which would leave many commuters without free access to public transportation. Mr. Bestwick stated that the packages provided to the Committee contain a petition signed by over a hundred individuals who would like a replacement park and ride facility. There is also a letter from the Town Council stating that it is also in favor of a replacement park and ride facility. Mr. Bestwick noted that Representative Craven and many others have expressed their position in favor of a replacement park and ride facility. Mr. Bestwick indicated that only the developer would benefit from the proposal before the Committee; not the State, not the Department and certainly not the commuters from North Kingstown and the surrounding area. Mr. Bestwick asked that the Committee vote to move the sale of the subject property forward with the condition that a replacement park and ride be provided at no cost to the tax payers. Chairman Renaud explained that the Committee can not vote on any request until an agency makes that specific request.

The Committee may move to go into Executive Session, pursuant to Rhode Island General Law 42-46-5(a)(5) for the specific purpose of

discussion or consideration related to the acquisition or lease of real property for public purpose, or of the disposition of publicly held property wherein advanced public information would be detrimental to the interest of the public relating to the following items:

A motion to enter into Executive Session was made by Mr. Griffith and seconded by Mr. Woolley.

A roll call vote was taken and the votes were as follows: Mr. Griffith voted “Aye” and Mr. Woolley voted “Aye” and Chairman Renaud voted “Aye.”

After a detailed discussion relating to Executive Session Items E1 and E2 concluded, a motion to return to the open session of the State Properties Committee meeting and to seal the Executive Session minutes, until such time as said matters are resolved, was made by Mr. Woolley and seconded by Mr. Griffith.

Passed Unanimously

Upon returning to open session at 10:44a.m., the Committee proceeded to

vote relative to Items E1 and E2 presented in Executive Session.

ITEM E1 – Department of Transportation – A request was made for approval to acquire land and easements by virtue of Condemnation Plat 2780 located on Atwood Avenue @ Plainfield Street in the Town of Johnston and the City of Cranston, in conjunction with State Traffic Construction Improvements. After discussion in Executive

Session, a motion was made to approve both Items E1 and E2 by Mr. Woolley and seconded by Mr. Griffith.

Passed Unanimously

ITEM E2 – Department of Transportation – A request was made for approval to acquire temporary and permanent easements by virtue of Condemnation Plat 2784 located on Atwood Avenue @ Walnut Grove Avenue in the City of Cranston in conjunction with State Traffic Construction Improvements as well as approval of and signatures on a Permanent Loop Detector Easement Agreement. After discussion in Executive Session, a motion was made to approve both Items E1 and E2 by Mr. Woolley and seconded by Mr. Griffith.

Passed Unanimously

There being no further business to come before the State Properties Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m. The motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Griffith and seconded by Mr. Woolley.

Passed Unanimously

Holly H. Rhodes, Executive Secretary